

**REMARKS**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 8, and 19 are pending and under consideration. No new matter is presented in this Amendment.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:**

Claims 1, 2, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by Jeong (KR 2002-0074550). In particular, the Examiner asserts that Jeong teaches a secondary battery comprising electrode tabs 520 that extend through a sealing surface 300 of a case 100, which are bent only once, at a substantially right angle.

Fig. D of Jeong shows that the protection circuit 400 (PCB) is disposed on the sealing surface 122, at a distance from the edge of the sealing surface 122. As would be apparent to one of skill in the art, in order for the electrode tabs 520 of Jeong to be attached to the PCB 400, the electrode tabs 520 must extend horizontally through the sealing surface 122, then must be bent a first time to extend vertically through the resin 300, and finally must be bent a second time to extend horizontally, back across the sealing surface 122, to the PCB 400. In other words, since the PCB 400 is not disposed on the edge of the sealing surface 122, the electrode tabs must be bent 180 degrees, in order to cover the distance between the PCB 400 and the edge of the sealing surface 122.

Therefore, Jeong fails to teach or disclose a pouch-type lithium secondary battery having electrode tabs that are bent only once, at a substantially right angle, as recited in present claim 1, because the tabs are bent 180 degrees. Accordingly, Jeong fails to teach or disclose all aspects of the rejected claims. Therefore, this rejection has been respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

**REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:**

Claims 1, 2, 8, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over AAPA. In particular, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to bend the electrode tabs of the AAPA only once, at a substantially right angle, because the electrode tabs will still be connected to the PCB, regardless of how they are bent.

Contrary to the assertion of the Examiner, if the electrode tabs of the AAPA were bent only once, at a substantially right angle, the electrode tabs would not be connected to the PCB, because, as shown in FIG. 2, the terminals of the PCB face downward, thereby necessitating at least a 180 degree bend in the electrode tabs. Furthermore, as recited in present paragraphs [0014] and [0015], bending electrode tabs in such a manner often results in the electrode tabs being cut during the bending process. In addition, the horizontal position of the PCT requires a larger sealing surface, and thus, increases the overall size of the battery.

Accordingly, the rejected claims are not obvious over the AAPA, because the variations between the AAPA and the presently claimed invention are not merely rearrangements of existing parts of the AAPA, and provide benefits not taught in the AAPA. Therefore, this rejection has been respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Jeong (KR 2002-0074550) in view of the AAPA. In particular, the Examiner asserts that the AAPA remedies the deficits of Jeong, by teaching electrode tapes.

For at least the reasons recited above, this combination fails to teach or disclose all aspects of the rejected claims. Therefore, this rejection has been respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and withdrawal are respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION:**

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.


Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 503333.

Respectfully submitted,

STEIN MCEWEN, LLP

Date: Feb 18, 2010

By:   
Nathan H. Cristler  
Registration No. 61,736

1400 Eye St., NW  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 216-9505  
Facsimile: (202) 216-9510